



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## OLD ENGLISH NOTES.

### I.

BEHŪDIGNES, "A DESERT."

IN Somner's *Dict. Saxonico-Latino-Anglicum* (1659) and in Lye's *Dict. Saxonico et Gothico-Latinum* (1772) we find a *behydignys*, *desertum*, and thence the word with this meaning assigned to it found its way into all the later dictionaries, down to the most modern ones, in which it is generally brought into connection with *hȳdan*, "to hide." I think I can show that there is no real authority for a *behydignes*, "a desert," and also how the error arose. Somner gives the word and its meaning without any reference, but Lye adds *Ps.* 28, 7, and his source<sup>1</sup> as well as Somner's is evidently John Spelman's *Psalterium Davidis Latino-Saxonicum vetus*, which appeared in 1640, nineteen years before the publication of Somner's dictionary. Spelman's text (from a MS in his own possession, now MS Stowe in the British Museum) reads *Vox domini concutientis desertum*, the last word being glossed *westen*. On the margin he gives the variant *behydignys* from MS C (now MS Ff. i. 23 in the Cambridge University Library), and this of course led the dictionary makers to believe that in MS C the Latin word *desertum* occurred and was glossed by *behydignys*. But a reference to this MS shows that its Latin text does not read *desertum* (the Gallican reading), but *solitudinem* (the Roman reading). Thus a gloss *desertum*, *behydignes*, does not exist at all.

For completeness' sake it may be well to give the readings of all the MSS:

MS Vespasian A. 1 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *bihygdignisse*.

MS Junius 27 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *bihydignesse*.

MS Ff. i. 23. has *solitudinem*, glossed by *behydignys*.

MS Royal 2. B. 5 has *solitudinem*, glossed by *westen*.

The remaining six MSS (MS Stowe 2, MS Vitellius E. 18, MS Tiberius C. 6, MS Arundel 60, MS Salisbury 150, MS Lambeth 427) all read *desertum*, glossed by *westen*.

<sup>1</sup> Whether direct or through the medium of Junius's collections is immaterial.

It is obvious that the glosses in the first three MSS go back to one archetype, and also that it originated in the glossator's wrongly reading *solitudinem* as *solicitudinem*,<sup>1</sup> for that is the meaning of the word; compare my *Old English Glosses*, I, 5430, *sollicitudo*, *bihydines* (the Brussels MS has *bighydignys*), and I, 906, *sollicitudinis*, *bihydine* (MS Brussels *bihyd*). Compare also Matth. (Rushworth), 13, 22, *sollicitudo*, *behygdnis*, and the Vercelli MS fol. 90b, *Ac uton we nu forþan ure sylfra lif mid mycle egesan and mid mycle behygdnesse geseon and sceawian ure sylfra lif and gecearnian we mid godum dædum*, etc.

The further question arises: Should the word be written with the prefix *be-* or *bī-*? The majority of the instances given, with their *bi-* or *big-*, decidedly point to the latter, and this is confirmed by the spellings of the adjective and adverb in Bede, which I here cite according to page and line from Miller's edition:

P. 282, l. 29: *bighygdig* T, *byg-* B,<sup>2</sup> *bi-* O, *bī-* Ca.

P. 466, l. 26: *behydegæsta* T, *be-* B.

P. 66, l. 22: *bihygdlice* T, *big-* B, *be-* O, *be-* Ca.

P. 210, l. 32: *bighygdlice* T, *be-* B.

P. 336, l. 33: *bihygdlice* T, *big-* B, *bi-* O, *big-* Ca.

P. 380, l. 22: *bighydglice* T, *big-* B, *bi-* C, *big*, O, Ca.

The evidence is thus decidedly in favor of *bī-*.

## II.

### HLOSE, "A PIGSTY."

In a passage in the so-called *Gerefa* (*Anglia*, IX, 261) we read, among the various duties to be performed in autumn, "*fald weoxian, scipena behweorfan and hlosan eac swa*." Liebermann translates *hlosan* by "schutzdach bauen" with a query, and adds in a note: "falls aus *hleō* (obdach, schirm) gebildet. Oder vorgänger von *looze* (schweinestall) bei Halliwell?" This latter suggestion is undoubtedly right, and indeed the context points to the same conclusion; the *fald* is the "sheepfold," the *scipena* are the "shippons" (cowhouses), and as a third we should naturally expect the places for housing the pigs. That

<sup>1</sup> I see that SWEET in his *Oldest English Texts*, p. 573, has noticed the scribe's confusion of *solitudo* with *solicitudo* in the *Vespasian Psalter*.

<sup>2</sup> I give the variants of the prefix only.

the word really does mean "pigsty" is confirmed by its occurrence in a gloss (Wright-Wülker, 204<sup>2</sup>): *Ceniluti* (read *ceniluti*, with Sievers, *Anglia*, XIII, 320) *swina hlose*. It is quite possible that the gloss has been assigned to a wrong lemma, or the glossator may have been thinking of the usual dirt in pigsties. The modern dialectal word *lewze* (pronounced *lūz*),<sup>1</sup> "a pigsty," is found in Somerset and Devon, and its present pronunciation points to an Old English long close *ō*.<sup>1</sup>

ARTHUR S. NAPIER.

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD,  
June, 1903.

---

LANCE SUR FAUTRE.

SINCE the publication of my article on "Lance sur fautre" in MODERN PHILOLOGY, October, 1903, a new passage has come to my knowledge, through the kindness of Professor T. A. Jenkins, which illustrates my theory better than any of those quoted before. It can be found in Foerster's edition of "Li chevaliers as deus espees," vss. 4675-83, and reads:

Parle orent en tel maniere  
Entr'els, puis se traisent arriere  
Et ont les cheuaus adrecies,  
S'ont les escus auant sacies  
Et mueuent li uns contre l'autre,  
*Si metent les lances sus fautre*  
*Et de fautre sous les aissieles,*  
Andeus les missent en astieles  
Si tost comme il s'entrencontrerent.

I should also like to correct a misprint which occurred on p. 1 of my above-mentioned article. In l. 9 "Old English" should be replaced by "Old French."

A. C. VON NOÉ.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. WRIGHT (*Dial. Dict.*, III, 584), who suggests connection with *lew* "a shelter, etc.," Old Engl. *hlēo*, but its occurrence in O. E. as *hlose* disproves that. Note that the development of O. E. *hlēo* to the modern *lew* presupposes the same shifting of stress that we have in Modern English *lose* from O. E. *-lēosan*.